

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed January 24, 2007. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 22-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

1. The Examiner rejected claims 22-42 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner asserts that the claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 22, the Examiner asserts that the specification as originally filed doesn't describe the feature of *sending an indication of the event of the first entry to the call control device if the timer expires before the CAS module recognizes a further change of line signaling state*. In particular, the claim states that "a call control device to communicate with a call agent using gateway control protocol signals." The Examiner understands the call control device in this limitation to correspond to unit 220 as depicted in figure 2 and 3 of the original specification. The Examiner considers the specification to disclose sending an indication to the **Local Call Agent FSM 320** and not to the call control device, see specification page 9, lines 1-3. The Examiner notes that the specification discloses "**The call agent is then notified of the event through the call control device**". See specification, page 8, lines 11-15. Thus, it appears to the Examiner that the event is sent to the call agent and not to the call control device.

Applicant has amended claim 22 so that the feature is --to send an indication of the event of the first entry to the call agent through the call control device-- . This is disclosed in the specification as filed on page 8, lines 14-15.

Regarding claims 23, 28, 29, 33, 34, 38, 39, the Examiner asserts that these claims suffer from similar deficiency with regard to "call control device" as indicated above with regard to claim 22. Applicant has amended these claims in a manner similar to claim 22.

Regarding claim 33 and 38, the Examiner asserts that the phrase "the channel associated signals" lack clear antecedent basis. Applicant has deleted "the" to correct the lack of antecedent basis.

Regarding claims 38-42, the Examiner asserts that the specification as originally filed doesn't describe a computer readable medium having instructions embodied thereon, which, when executed by a processing system, causes the system to perform the steps indicated in claims 38-42. In addition, the Examiner asserts that the method steps of figure 4 are different from those recited in claims 38-42.

Applicant has amended claims 38-42 to recite --a computer readable memory having computer instructions embodied thereon, which, when executed by a computer processing system, causes the computer processing system to perform a method-- as disclosed by the specification as filed on page 11, lines 18-21.

The Examiner subjects claims 24-27, 31, 32, and 35-37 to the same rejections as their respective base claims 22, 28, and 33. Applicant traverses these rejections based on the amendments of the base claims.

Regarding claims 25, 31, 36, and 41, the Examiner asserts that the phrase "the associated signaling state" is confusing because "the associated signaling state" lacks antecedent basis.

Applicant has amended these claims to recite --an associated signaling state-- to correct the lack of antecedent basis.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 22-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Conclusion

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.